

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGs. 1, 2 and 3. In particular, referenced numeral 12 associated with the element “Audio Source” is changed to reference numeral 13 to avoid duplication with reference numeral 12 as used to identify the element “telecoil.” No new matter is added.

Attachment:	Replacement sheets
	Annotated sheets showing changes

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 13-32 are rejected in the action. Claims 9 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to in the action as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5). Specifically, the drawings are objected to for indicating the reference numerals 15, 16”, 17”, 19’ and 28, where these reference numerals do not appear in the specification. Also, the reference numeral 12 is repeated for both the element “telecoil” and the element “audio source.” By way of amendment to the specification and the drawings, the applicants have corrected this oversight. No new matter is added by the applicants’ amendment of the specification and drawings. In view thereof, the applicants submit the objection is moot, and request that it be withdrawn.

Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to in the action. In particular, it is indicated that in Paragraph [0016], the phrase “threshold value input 19” should be changed to –threshold value input 19’--. By way of the aforementioned amendments to the specification, such correction has been made. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Rejection of the claims

Claims 1,6,7,10,11,14,15,16,20,21,23,24,25,29,30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sacha et al (US 2004/0052392 A1, hereinafter “Sacha”). With the exception of claims 9 and 12, which are indicated as allowable, the remaining claims are rejected as being unpatentable over Sacha in view of various additional references.

The applicants do not believe Sacha is prior art to the instant application, and as such, that the examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of unpatentability. In that regard, the applicants reserve the right to provide evidence of possession of the invention prior to the September 12, 2002 filing date of Sacha, if such becomes necessary.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the applicants submit that Sacha does not anticipate the indicated claims because Sacha lacks a teaching or suggestion of a gate, as set forth in claims 1 and 14 or a magnetic field threshold comparator as set forth in claim 24. Furthermore, because Sacha lacks any teaching or suggestion of these elements, neither Sacha nor the proffered combinations can render the invention unpatentable.

Sacha teaches that multiple sources are coupled directly to a signal processing unit by operation of a switching circuit 4. This is clearly shown, for example, in Figs. 1-4 and the accompanying description. In other embodiments incorporating a signal selection or switching functionality, for example, those shown in Figs. 7 and 8, only a single source is coupled to the circuit that operates in various ways on that single signal (e.g., various filtering and/or circuit programming) based upon the selection and/or switching functionality.

In contrast, claims 1 and 14 set forth, among other things, a gate including a plurality of inputs and single output. The gate is coupled to the plurality of input, not the signal processing device. The gate functions to couple the selected source to the signal processing device. In this manner, the signal processing device can be simplified to have a signal source input that is coupled to the gate output. Sacha fails to teach or suggest such an element, and as such, Sacha cannot anticipate or render the invention embodied by these claims unpatentable. As claims 2-13 and 15-23 depend from claims 1 and 14, respectively, these claims too are allowable.

Claim 24 sets forth, among other things, that the magnetic field threshold comparator has a first input and a second input and a single output. The magnetic field threshold comparator operates to couple one of the first and second signals to the output such that the output is then coupled to other signal processing functionality. As noted above, Sacha fails to teach or suggest an element, and as such, Sacha cannot anticipate or render the

Application No. 10/736,151
Amendment dated February 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

Docket No.: 30521/3060A

invention embodied by these claims unpatentable. As claims 25-32 depend from claim 24, these claims too are allowable.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Anthony G. Sitko

Registration No.: 36,278

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments